

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 7 was objected to.

Claims 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Harrison (2004/0045039).

Claims 32, 38-41 and 43-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Dureau (2002/0056112).

Claim 48 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Ellis (2005/0028208).

Claim 7, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of Burnett (WO 01/31852).

Claims 30, 31 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison in view of Lortz (6,349,410).

Detailed Remarks

Claim 7

As amended, an embodiment of Claim 7 recites a receiver system that is capable of both (i) receiving and storing multimedia content, and (ii) communicating with multiple types of interconnected devices. Claim 7 further recites:

wherein the receiver system is configured to control anyone of the plurality of devices with the command [from the palmtop computer], the plurality of devices including a set of one or more audio-video devices that are capable of receiving or generating audio and video from the multimedia content....

Among other differences, Applicant respectfully submits that Ellis lacks any teaching of a receiving system that can control multiple types of audio devices using a command communicated from a palmtop computer. In Applicant's claims, the command from the palmtop computer can change the state of multiple devices. Additionally, the

palmtop computer can receive and display multimedia content from the receiver system, whether that content is stored or received by broadcast or digital connection.

It will be appreciated that such an embodiment as described provides a more comprehensive system, as compared to those described with other systems of Ellis or the cited art.

Claim 15

With regard to Claim 15, Applicant respectfully submits that Harrison displays URLs and links or interactive data. For example, consider Paragraph 0055 of Harrison:

embodiment, associated data may consist of references such as uniform resource locations ("URL") which are WWW page references. Associated data may include references to Internet News Groups which are shared static messages grouped by topic which may be accessed. Associated data may also include references to Internet Relay Chat areas which are multi-person dynamic conversation streams that enable users to communicate by text messages. Or, associated data may include pointers to information on an online service such as America Online, Prodigy or Compuserve. Thus, a menu may list several references. And by clicking on a reference, the system actually connects to and retrieves the referenced information from the appropriate source.

In contrast, Applicant's claimed embodiment recites "enabling a user of a palmtop computer ...to respond to *dramatic audio/video events* that are depicted as part of the television content." These audio/video events depict "actions". As example, these audio/video events depict events in a television game show (which is a staged dramatic event). They do not depict events that correlate to transmission of data or web content that supplements the so-called primary data of Harrison.

Claim 30

Similarly to analysis provided with Claim 15, Claim 30 recites:

enabling a user to manipulate a palmtop computer to respond to one or more events that are *depicted as actions or events depicted in the audio and video content of the television program...*

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art do not teach the ability for the user to respond to actions or events depicted in the audio and video of a television program. The events depicted by Harrison, for example, are not audio and video events.

Claim 32

With regard to Claim 32, Applicant concedes that [0065] of Dureau teaches multiple users can each operate a digital assistant in interacting with a television system. However, Applicant notes that the multiple users use separate digital assistants to communicate with the same television system. An embodiment of Applicant's Claim 32 recites:

enabling the input from the user to be communicated over the network to one or more participants who are (i) displaying the audio-video content by separately processing a different multimedia signal, and (ii) interacting with the audio-video events of the audio-video content using corresponding palmtop computers.
[See Para. 0028]

Applicant respectfully submits that this distinction is different than Dureau, which requires the viewers to watch the same television system. Here, as illustrated by example in paragraphs [0025] and [0028], the user participate, for example, in a game or show and compete against others who are seeing the same game or show.

Claim 38

Applicant submits Claim 38 is allowable for similar reasons as those set forth with Claim 32. Among other distinguishing facets, Claim 38 recites in part:

wherein the broadcast is communicated to a plurality of receiving systems at the same time, including to the receiving system of the user and to other receiving systems of other users ... wherein the receiver system is configured to receive the one or more inputs from the palmtop computer, and to enable the one or more inputs to be communicated over the network to the users of the other receiving system.

In Dureau, the viewers watch the same television system (see Para. 0065). Accordingly, the aforementioned feature is not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Claim 46

Likewise, Claim 46 recites:

wherein each palmtop computer is configured to communicate with a corresponding one of the plurality of receiver systems over the network, each receiver system receiving the broadcast containing audio and video content independent of the other receiving systems and communicating at least a portion of the broadcast to the corresponding one of the palmtop computers using the network...

For reasons that include those stated above, Applicant submits Claim 46 is not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Claim 48

With regard to Claim 48, Applicant respectfully submits that Ellis lacks the feature of amended Claim 48:

wherein the receiver system is configured to transmit one or more selected television programs to the palmtop computer over a network, wherein the receiver system is configured to identify the selected television programs from user-input that is entered on the palmtop computer and communicated over the network, wherein the selected television programs correspond to (i) a selected television program as it is received from a broadcast, and (ii) a selected locally stored television program of the receiver system.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions of Ellis (e.g. para. 0133), for example, provide for storing a “local interactive program guide”. In Applicant’s claimed embodiment, the receiver system is capable of storing television programs, and communicating the television programs to the palmtop computer using a network.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is requested, based on the remarks and amendments provided with this paper. If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at (408) 551-6632.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1914. No Previously Presented matter is being provided with this amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 4, 2008

/ Zurvan Mahamedi/
Zurvan Mahamedi Reg. No. 42,828

4880 Stevens Creek Blvd., Suite 201
San Jose, CA 95129-1034
(408) 236-6640